

REMARKS

Only claims 15, 16 and 25 stand rejected based upon prior art under 35 USC § 103(a).

The remaining claims are rejected only under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

By this paper, amendments have been made to independent claim 1 and dependent claims 10 and 11, which are believed to cure the objection the Examiner stated with respect to indefiniteness. It is pointed out in the description, at page 7, lines 25-27, that hybridization may take place either before or after there is immobilization of one strand on the solid phase, as now recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 1, 3, and 5-13 should now be in allowable condition. Reconsideration of the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph and withdrawal with respect to these claims are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 14 has also been amended in a manner which should remove the objection stated by the Examiner, and it is believed that independent claim 14 should now be in allowable condition.

Independent claims 15 and 22 have been amended similarly to claim 1 so as to specify that the order for steps (d) and (e) may be varied as pointed out at page 7, lines 25-27. It is believed that these changes should now render these two independent claims no longer objectionable under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection on this basis are respectfully requested. Inasmuch as this was the only objection to claim 22, it is believed that claim 22 and dependent claim 24 should now be allowed.

Only claims 15, 16 and 25 were rejected based upon prior art, and claim 25 has now been canceled.

Independent claim 15 has been amended so as to insert the generic equivalent of the algorithm that is used; the specific algorithm, which is recited in claims 1 and 22, is used when the short tandem repeat polymorphism of interest is Fragile X. Basis for this recitation of the generic equivalent of the Fragile X algorithm is found in the description on page 18, line 25 through page 19, line 4. It is submitted that, with this change, independent claim 15 should be allowable for the reasons previously set forth with respect to independent claims 1 and 22 and dependent claims 2 and 23 (which were being respectively incorporated therein). Accordingly, it is believed that independent claim 15 and dependent claim 16 should now be allowed, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

In the absence of more pertinent prior art, it is believed that claims 1, 3, 5-16, 22 and 24 should be allowed. It is believed that the application has been placed in condition for allowance, and favorable action is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

Address all correspondence to:
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
120 So. LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600
Chicago, IL 60603

Direct telephone inquiries to:
James J. Schumann
(858) 552-1311
San Diego, California Office of
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
J:\81671\81671AMD.FINAL.doc

/James J. Schumann/
James J. Schumann
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 20,856

Date: August 20, 2008